

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-9, 11, and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Packer (US 6,058,453). Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Drawings

It is noted that the Examiner has accepted the drawings as originally filed with this application.

Claim Amendments

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 18, and 19 of this application. It is believed that the amended claims specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, and define subject matter that is patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

In the present invention, claim 1 has been amended to read: "the starting block is decided by counting a number of blocks from a target block" (emphasis added). FIG. 3 of the present invention and its relative descriptions depict an example of the relationship between the target block and the starting block.

That is to say, the starting block and the target block are different. As illustrated in this example, with this counting back step, the subcode decoding procedure can be properly postponed so that a main data and its corresponding subcode can be buffered in the same buffering unit.

Whereas, Packer does not teach this counting back step at all. Furthermore, Packer synchronizes data and subcodes by postponing the timing when the subcodes are released from the buffer memory (Col. 9, Lines 60-63). Applicant submits claim 1 of the present invention is not taught in Packer.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Packer does not anticipate the amended claim 1. Similarly, the function of the address control unit in the amended claim 11 includes "the starting block is decided by counting a number of blocks from a target

block" (claim 11 of the present invention) (emphasis added). The arguments set forth above regarding to claim 1 also apply to claim 11. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 11.

Applicant submits that the dependent claims 2-10 and 13-20 not specifically addressed herein are allowable for the reasons discussed in pertinent portions associated with their independent claims 1 and 11, as well as for their own additional features. For the reasons discussed above, reconsideration of claims 1-11 and 13-20 is respectfully requested.

It is axiomatic in U.S. patent law that, in order for a reference to anticipate a claimed structure, it must clearly disclose each and every feature of the claimed structure. Applicant submits that it is abundantly clear, as discussed above, that Packer does not disclose each and every feature of Applicant's amended claims and, therefore, could not possibly anticipate these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Absent a specific showing of these features, Packer cannot be said to anticipate any of Applicant's amended claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

It is further submitted that Packer does not disclose, or suggest any modification of the specifically disclosed structures that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at Applicant's claimed structure. Thus, it is not believed that Packer renders obvious any of Applicant's amended claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Application No. 10/617,807


Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 13, 2007

By:


John R. Guice, Jr.
Reg. No. 39,699

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 40144